

Application No.: «AppNumber»

Case No.: «CaseNumber»

REMARKS

This is in response to the Examiner's action mailed July 7, 2006. Claims 8 through 15, 23 through 30, 38 through 45, 53 through 65, 73 through 85, and 93 through 105 have been withdrawn from consideration. In the action the Examiner rejected claims 1 through 7, 16 through 22, 31 through 37, 46 through 52, 66 through 72, 86 through 92, and 93 through 105, all of the claims currently under consideration. The Examiner further entered objections to claims 51, 52, 69, 71, 72, 91, and 92.

In response to the Examiners objections, the applicants have made the amendments recommended by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claims 31 through 33, 35, 37, and 106 through 110 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Japanese Kokai 2001-350008 (Sumitomo). The Examiner details various aspects of the claims that she alleges are shown in this reference. However, she never even suggests that the prisms are arranged such that "in a reflective mode, light incident onto the first surface at a reflected incident angle is refracted through the first surface, reflected at the first facet of a first prismatic structure, reflected at the second facet of a second prismatic structure, and refracted through the first surface." The examiner could not attribute this limitation to the Sumitomo reference since it clearly does not teach it. Since this limitation is present in all of rejected claims, they are clearly not anticipated by the Sumitomo reference.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 through 7, 16 through 22, 34, 36, 46 through 52, 66 through 72, and 86 through 92 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious in view of the Sumitomo reference in combination with United States Patent 6,172,809 (Koike *et al.*). The applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner that the present invention is obvious in view of these references for at least two reasons.

First, the present invention is a transflective system, *e.g.* one that operates in reflective mode by reflecting ambient light and in transmissive mode by transmitting light generated by a light source behind the system. The Koike references teaches a transmissive system that does not have a reflective mode. Although they both act as backlights, they operate in very different ways and have very different requirements. One of skill in the art of backlights would not be motivated to look to transmissive systems to design a transflective system.

Application No.: «AppNumber»

Case No.: «CaseNumber»

Even if one were to turn to the transmissive art, the combination proposed by the Examiner would not yield the present invention. As explained above, the Sumitomo reference does not teach a system in which the prisms are arranged such that "in a reflective mode, light incident onto the first surface at a reflected incident angle is refracted through the first surface, reflected at the first facet of a first prismatic structure, reflected at the second facet of a second prismatic structure, and refracted through the first surface." Since the system of the Koike *et al.* patent does not even have a reflective mode, it certainly cannot add this feature or in any way suggest it.

Because the present invention, as defined by the claims currently under consideration, is clearly patentable in view of the cited art, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of those claims and allow them.

Respectfully submitted,

December 29, 2006

Date

By:

Stephen W. Buckingham
Stephen W. Buckingham, Reg. No.: 30,035
Telephone No.: 651-733-3379

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833

Best Available Copy